St. Charles Seminary Library
Carthagena, Ohio
MAR 2 5 '59

THE 'ENEMY' ON FILM
—Maryvonne Butcher

THE
Commonweal

A Shift in Emphasis

Imperatives of Foreign Aid

by A. William Loos

A Catholic for President?

Senator Kennedy and His Critics

A Sampling from the Catholic Press

THOREAU IN CORRESPONDENCE . . . . . by James B. Stronks
FIELDING'S SECOND NOVEL . . . . . by Jean Holzhauer
AN EARLY PRESCOTT . . . . . by Elizabeth Bartelme
TREE AT GUADALUPE CHURCH . . . by Sister Maris Stella, C.S.J.

lume LXIX, No. 25 March 20, 1959 Twenty-Five Cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

help means life itself...

Ninh Ngoc Ny, Vietnamese, age 6. Mother dead. Father works occasionally. Earns $10.00 per month. Child's 13 year old brother looks after house and younger children. Family fled communists in north. First lived in refugee camp. Now live in Saigon. Situation desperate. Lack food, clothing, everything. No money for school fee. Child sad, distressed. Wants to be teacher when she grows up. Help to this child means life for whole family. Will keep family unit together. Help urgent.

You alone, or as a member of a group, can help these children by becoming a Foster Parent. You will be sent the case history and photographs of "your child" upon receipt of application with initial payment. "Your child" is told that you are his or her Foster Parent. At once the child is touched by love and a sense of belonging. All correspondence is through our office, and is translated and encouraged. We do no mass relief. Each child, treated as an individual, receives a monthly cash grant of eight dollars plus food, clothing, shelter, education and medical care according to his or her needs. Your help is vital to a child struggling for life. Won't you let some child love you?

Plan is a non-political, non-profit, non-sectarian, government-approved, independent relief organization, helping children, wherever the need—in France, Belgium, Italy, Greece, Western Germany, Korea, and Viet Nam—and is registered under No. VFA019 with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the United States Government and is filed with the National Information Bureau in New York City.

© 1959 FPP, Inc.

Foster Parents' Plan, Inc.

352 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 10, NEW YORK • FOUNDED 1937

PARTIAL LIST OF SPONSORS AND FOSTER PARENTS

Mary Pickford
Mr. and Mrs. Robert W. Sarnoff
Dr. John Haynes Holmes
C. D. Jackson
Helen Hayes
Dr. Howard A. Rusk
Edward R. Murrow
Bing Crosby
K. C. Gifford
Gov. & Mrs. Walter Kohler
Charles R. Hook
Steve Allen
Gary Moore

FOSTER PARENTS' PLAN, INC. COM-3-20-59
352 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y.
In Canada: P. O. Box 65, Sta. B, Montreal, Que.

A. I wish to become a Foster Parent of a needy child for one year. If possible, sex...., age...., nationality.....
I will pay $15 a month for one year ($180). Payment will be monthly ( ), quarterly ( ), semi-anually ( ), yearly ( ).
I enclose herewith my first payment $.....
B. I cannot "adopt" a child, but I would like to help a child by contributing $.....

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Zone..... State .....

Date ..... Contributions are deductible from Income Tax

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE
Commonweal
A Weekly Review of Public Affairs, Literature, and the Arts
THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR OF PUBLICATION

week by week

Aftermath of the Kennedy Statement

TWO WEEKS AGO in these pages we gave our views on Senator Kennedy's now-famous remarks in *Look* magazine. In general, reaction to The Commonweal's editorial seems to have been that it was "moderate." We certainly intended nothing else, and we hope the description is accurate. For we must say that we have been disturbed at some of the comments that have since appeared in the Catholic press, a sampling of which, good and bad, may be found elsewhere in this issue.

In our editorial we expressed "a few reservations and regrets" about Mr. Kennedy's statement. Before returning to the issue, we want to emphasize that our remarks were directed at Senator Kennedy's position, not at him—an obvious point it would be unnecessary to make if it were not for the tone of some of the comment on the subject.

To us, many of the remarks about Senator Kennedy that have appeared in the Catholic press seem to have passed the legitimate limits of editorial comment. Further, although we criticized his statement on the grounds that it tended to confuse certain basic issues, it was a model of clarity compared to other statements that have appeared since.

When we first read the *Look* article, we thought its effect would be bad; in our opinion, many of the comments that have been made since then have only compounded the problem. For instance, one non-Catholic columnist has already said that Senator Kennedy was forced "to declare himself for the separation of Church and State . . . this has led to criticism of him in the Catholic press. . . ." Serious misunderstanding of American Catholic thinking on Church and State is obviously in the making.

In our initial comments on Senator Kennedy's statement, we remarked that his approach to the subject of religion and government seemed "an unnecessarily simple view of this most complex problem. Anyone seriously concerned with the relation of personal belief to matters of public policy receives little reassurance from the simple rejection of the problem in Senator Kennedy's statement." We still wish Senator Kennedy's wording had been more precise, but we fear that some of the editorials in the Catholic press about secularism and the importance of conscience have for many people obscured an elementary but crucial point: there is no conflict between the Catholic conscience and the oath to uphold the American Constitution.

AS WE WROTE two weeks ago, "We cannot say that we share any feeling of relief concerning the Senator's position on Church and State, because we never felt any apprehension, never believed that there was a 'conflict of loyalties' involved." We still do not. Indeed, one of our major objections to the *Look* article was not that Senator Kennedy was quoted in support of the separation of Church and State as set forth in the Constitution, but that "he seemed to be saying that he did not take the position one might expect from a Catholic, but took instead the 'Constitutional' and 'First Amendment' position . . . he gave the impression that this [belief in the separation of Church and State] was a point at issue between Catholics and non-Catholics and that Catholics might be expected *not* to believe in it. To accept this version of the question is to fall into the trap prepared by such as Paul Blanshard and the P.O.A.U."

The important thing here is that Catholics in the United States *do* accept separation of Church and State and always have. If there are Catholics who would like to change the American system, we have never met them. Although the reference is a fa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miliar one, it may be worth repeating here that the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States are publicly on record on this question. Taking note of the fears of non-Catholics on this subject and speaking explicitly on behalf of all the American Bishops, Archbishop John T. McNicholas said in 1948:

"We deny absolutely and without qualification that the Catholic Bishops of the United States are seeking a union of Church and State by any endeavors whatsoever, either proximately or remotely. If tomorrow Catholics constituted a majority in our country, they would not seek a union of Church and State. They would, then as now, uphold the Constitution and all its Amendments, recognizing the moral obligation imposed upon all Catholics to observe and defend the Constitution and its Amendments."

This statement is clear and unequivocal. Coming as it does from the American Bishops, it involves a solemn commitment and has a moral force not to be found in comment by us or any other Catholic editors. The Bishops' statement, we submit, should not be ignored in these discussions, by either Catholics or non-Catholics; to give the impression that American Catholics are opposed to the Constitution and the First Amendment is dangerous and untrue.

If Catholics are united with other Americans in supporting the Constitution, there is, of course, disagreement about the *meaning* of Church-State separation in specific instances. This disagreement may at the moment particularly involve Catholics; it is certainly not peculiar to them, and there is ample historical precedent for disagreement in Constitutional interpretation.

Thus some Americans seem to believe there is a Constitutional violation in having a chaplain in Congress; most citizens probably do not, and the practice continues. Some Americans feel that allowing parochial school children to ride tax-supported buses violates the First Amendment; others —and not only Catholics, by any means—say this is a welfare-safety measure directed to the child, not the school, and recent court decisions seem to uphold this latter view.

Instances like these, in which interpretations of the First Amendment vary, could be multiplied almost indefinitely. This is the case because the Constitutional provisions that apply to religion work in two directions. On the one hand there is the provision against "establishment"; on the other there is the safeguard for freedom of conscience. The really difficult problems arise in those areas where the two Constitutional goals tend to overlap or conflict, and the questions that arise in connection with parochial schools are particularly good examples.

Catholics feel in conscience that they must send their children to religiously oriented schools. Is their Constitutional right to freedom of religion being curtailed if no tax adjustment is made to permit them to follow their consciences in this matter without great hardship? Many Catholics are convinced that it is. For them to raise this question is not, we insist, "coming out against separation of Church and State," as some claim. To raise such questions is in the best American tradition, just as it is in the American tradition to take into account the conscientious beliefs held by Quakers when writing draft laws, or the religious beliefs of Christian Scientists in teaching science in the public schools. Our state is not Catholic, or Protestant, or Jewish; it is neutral, and it should always be truly neutral—not "neutral against" Catholics or any other group.

On this score we felt Senator Kennedy's statement erred on the side of oversimplification. "He seems," we wrote, "to have accepted the view that of the varying Constitutional interpretations which are put forth, one view—the secularist view, nowadays—is the 'real' Constitutional position. . . ." We would still make the same judgment—but we also wish some of Senator Kennedy's critics had given more thought to their own comments on this very touchy subject.

It would be a national tragedy if the question of a Catholic's nomination for the Presidency produced a new wave of religious bigotry. Unfortunately, reaction to the Kennedy statement provides ample proof that such an eventuality is entirely possible. How much of the public interest in this question is due to anti-Catholicism? Protestants, Jews and non-believers will have to examine their own consciences on this score; they alone can determine to what extent they are being influenced by Constitutional considerations and to what extent historic anti-Catholic feeling is at work. But we do not believe that Catholics can simply protest the fact of anti-Catholicism and leave the matter there.

It is true that fears about what it would mean to have a Catholic in the White House are undoubtedly exaggerated by organizations like the P.O.A.U. Nonetheless, we think these fears must be faced, and Catholics might well consider how often they have unnecessarily contributed to them. A good beginning for such self-examination, we suggest, would be a careful consideration of the tone and direction of some of the Catholic comments on the Kennedy statement.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THIS WEEK

Week by Week 635

Imperatives of Foreign Aid
by A. William Loos 639

Tree at Guadalupe Church: A Poem
by Sister Maris Stella, C.S.J. 641

The 'Enemy' on Film
by Maryvonne Butcher 642

Senator Kennedy and His Critics
from the Catholic Press 645

A Catholic for President?—I
by John Cogley 649

The Stage
by Richard Hayes 650

The Screen
by Philip T. Hartung 651

Communications 652

Books 653

THE COMMONWEAL
386 FOURTH AVENUE
NEW YORK 16

Editor
EDWARD S. SKILLIN

Managing Editor
JAMES O'GARA

Associate Editors
JAMES FINN
RICHARD HORCHLER

Drama Critic: RICHARD HAYES; *Movie Critic:* PHILIP T. HARTUNG; *Social Action:* JOHN C. CORT; *Paris:* ROBERT BARRAT; *Rome:* GUNNAR D. KUMLIEN; *Great Britain:* MICHAEL P. FOGARTY

JOHN BRUBAKER: *Advertising Manager*

Entered as second-class matter at the post office at Orange, Conn., under the act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the U.S.A. and published weekly at 440 Post Road, Orange, Conn. by the Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc., 386 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N.Y. MUrray Hill 3-9685.

Copyright © 1959 The Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc.

U. S. and Canada, $8 a year. Foreign, $10. Single copies 25¢

CURBS ON DEPLETION ALLOWANCES

AMERICAN oil companies are in the forefront of those mining and mineral industries that enjoy the highest tax depletion allowances. The theory is that the 27½ per cent deducted from their taxable income makes up for the losses they incur as successive sources of supply become used up. This "subsidy" on the government's part has long been under fire, especially since the larger oil companies have consistently made such high profits. Now the Treasury Department itself has taken up the charge before the House Ways and Means Committee. The objective is legislation for the mining and mineral industries that would reverse the rulings of various courts that now permit the companies to base their depletion deductions on the value of their finished petroleum products rather than their production of crude oil. Such a law would lessen apprehension that one large private element in the American economy is being unduly favored and it would produce more tax revenue at a time when it is sorely needed.

CONTINUING HISTORY OF DR. ZHIVAGO

BORIS PASTERNAK'S impressive novel continues to stir criticism and praise. Outside of the Soviet Union, where it is still suppressed, it continues to be the focus of discussions about art, about politics, and about their relation. In no country, however, is *Dr. Zhivago* likely to have more immediate political effect than in the country which has most recently felt its impact—Japan.

The Japanese chapter of the International Pen Club (Playwrights, Essayists and Novelists) had invited Arthur Koestler, then visiting Japan, to deliver an address. In an open letter which was published in all the leading papers, Mr. Koestler rejected the invitation. And he spelled out the reasons for his rejection in clear, unequivocal terms. The Japanese Pen Club had passed a resolution which criticized the injection of political issues into discussions about Pasternak and *Dr. Zhivago*. Mr. Koestler pointed out that this resolution, which had gone largely unnoticed, apparently condemned, not the Russians who suppressed the novel and caused Pasternak to reject the Nobel Prize, but those who defended Pasternak and praised the novel. The moral implications of the resolution, Mr. Koestler suggested, had been slighted or ignored.

Mr. Koestler and the Pen Club then exchanged letters, both maintaining and developing their origi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nal positions. Mr. Koestler is so highly regarded in Japan, and the controversy so extended itself, that the exchange gained national attention. Japan's most widely circulated paper, the *Asahi*, ran a long editorial in which it drew strong conclusions.

"Let us cite the fact," it said, "that while the Japanese intellectual reacts violently against anything nationalistic, he is more or less feeble in the way he reacts to the Leftist movements. . . . The Japanese have in the past suffered enormously as a result of ultranationalism, but they have no knowledge from personal experience of the over-all effects brought about by Leftist movements."

The editorial concluded by saying that "there is surely, here, the need for a great awakening on the part of the intellectuals of Japan."

This controversy and the editorial admonition of the *Asahi* may be of more significance than is readily apparent. For the present Japan Teachers Union is so controlled by the relatively few members who are skilled Communists that it is widely, if privately, admitted that many students are being subjected to Communist indoctrination. When the Liberal-Conservative coalition government attempted to initiate educational reforms it met with such organized and even violent opposition that the measures were withdrawn. And while educational measures initiated by the government meet with such response, very few educators or recognized intellectuals have openly criticized the abuses of the Communist-dominated Teachers Union.

Now, for the first time, the controversy raging around Pasternak and the Pen Club resolution puts the Leftist educators and intellectuals in a defensive position where their real interests are exposed and subject to sharp criticism.

AMERICA'S ECONOMY CARS

FEW PRODUCTS of American enterprise have earned greater credit and blame for influencing our way of life than the automobile, now standard equipment for a majority of suburban and non-metropolitan households. The proverbial Sunday driver has long held forth as an embodiment of our restlessness. The teen-age driver looms as an ever-increasing hazard to life and limb in America. The prevalence of cars has brought on a whole range of family and social problems. And it is a commonplace to gauge the state of the nation's economic health by the number of new car sales.

It would be surprising, then, if the introduction of new, smaller, economy cars by the Big Three auto-makers this fall does not have wide economic and social repercussions. Much will depend, of course, on the new product's catching on, but that seems to be inevitable. The aggregate sales of present Lark, Rambler and foreign cars have finally convinced the bigger companies. When their promotion mills start grinding on behalf of their own latest products of American technical ingenuity, there is no telling how much of a shift to more compact, more economical automobiling will result. The prediction already is that the smaller domestic and foreign cars will account for a fifth of the auto sales in 1959.

This represents a check to the monotonous trend towards ever longer, wider, flashier, more powerful models. Does it mean that tastes are changing or does it reflect instead such factors as the dimensions of the older suburban garage, difficulties in parking, the high cost of high-octane gasoline, etc.? The saving promised on the purchase price of the new economy models is disappointingly modest—two hundred dollars for much less car, little difference when spread out in installments. Perhaps high mileage per gallon often has a psychological impact far beyond its terms in dollars and cents. In any case Madison Avenue can be counted on to do its bit to make economy highly fashionable.

It will be a welcome change to have two distinct types of American cars in congested streets and on crowded highways. But we do not believe that present owners need fear that their current family car is doomed by this impending development to become obsolete.

BOLIVIA'S RIOTS

THE RIOTS in La Paz, Bolivia, have now subsided, order is restored, and U.S. officials can again safely work at the Embassy. The immediate cause of the riots, it is reported, was an article in the Latin-American edition of *Time* in which a U.S. official joked, "The only solution for Bolivia's problems is to abolish Bolivia. Let her neighbors divide up the country and the problems."

The U.S. Embassy denies that the jest was made, and the report, true or false, seems too slight to account for the riots; yet it appears that the quotation touched off latent anti-Americanism that has been years in the making. It is too much to expect that our recent increased attention to South American problems should have suddenly dissipated this sentiment. The riots are a sign, however, that our renewed attention was called for—and still is.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperatives of Foreign Aid

Can the free world demonstrate that the standard of living of nations in the non-Communist orbit can be materially and rapidly increased?

by A. WILLIAM LOOS

DURING THE big rice famine in Bengal, when some three million people suffered starvation, disease and endemic death, a powerful painting called "Madonna 1943" was produced by Zainul Abedin, one of "the young elders" among Pakistani painters. The painting depicts a pot-bellied, spindle-legged child "scavenging for milk in the famished breast of a horrifying skeleton which was not long ago its mother." Famine conditions did not obtain in Asia while I was there last autumn, but "Madonna 1943" symbolizes faithfully for me that part of the world, with its squalor and desperate poverty. This elemental response to widespread hunger colored all my other reactions.

The statistics about differences in standards of living must, perhaps, be seen in terms of hunger to have them jolt us. Let the digit 1 represent the standard of of living in Asia: then in 1938 the comparable figure for Western Europe was 8 and for the U.S., 13. In 1949 the figures were: Asia, 1; Latin America, 3; Western Europe, 11; the U.S., 31. The wide gap between developed and underdeveloped keeps widening. The average per capita income of the approximately one billion people in underdeveloped countries, excluding Red China, is about sixty dollars a year, less than one-tenth of the average in the West.

We are all familiar with such statistics. The over-all problem, set in sharp focus by such figures, always appears urgent to us; but when we see the problem personally, in concrete human terms, the urgency attains an intense immediacy. The question boils down simply to this: can the free world demonstrate that the standard of living and the over-all development of nations in the non-Communist orbit can be materially and fairly rapidly increased? Many Asians recognize this problem clearly. They understand that the rapid advances made in China under a totalitarian regime appear extremely alluring to the South and Southeast Asians. Even when deeply committed to free institutions, they wonder if their nations can develop rapidly enough to meet the challenge of accelerating progress in Red China. Many of them feel as overwhelmed as we do when we think seriously about the slow rate of development in the non-committed countries in terms of their population explosion.

The specter of hunger should sufficiently jar complacency to keep a discussion of this gargantuan problem from degenerating into the kind of patter that might be termed "the bland talking with the bland." We must look hard enough at the rapid development of the Soviet Union and Communist China to recognize once and for all that the appeal of these nations' fabulous growth is very persuasive to the underdeveloped areas. When the end results are viewed, the totalitarian methods that have been and are being used to attain them are often minimized. For one thing, nature's toll of human life and resources has been and is immensely expensive in areas bound by immemorial poverty. Perhaps the toll of dictatorial means would be no greater, it is thought, and apparently it can be effective by bringing into being a better material life. Such an argument, specious though it be, is elaborated persuasively by some Southeast Asians even when they themselves are devoting their energies to the development of effective goverment by consent.

There is also the dogmatism of the avowed Communist in Asia. When I suggested to the leader of the Communist Party in one Southeast Asian nation that an experimental approach, pointed toward the over-all development of his country, should be used, he replied: "Why experiment? We have learned in the Soviet Union what methods will produce rapid development."

Dr. Loos is executive director of the Church Peace Union, an organization founded by Andrew Carnegie to relate ethics and foreign policy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FREE WORLD in general and the United States in particular must yet demonstrate that it can induce reasonably rapid development in nations within the non-Communist orbit. Two factors are involved in laying the groundwork of such a demonstration: first of all, we must change the emphasis in our foreign aid program, meeting here the issue of allocation of resources, and then we must answer the question of whether America is willing to pay the price.

The emphasis in our foreign aid program must be shifted to give primary attention to over-all economic development in uncommitted nations. Neglect of military strength will bring us immediate defeat, it is true. But preoccupation with military strength alone is a cardinal danger today. The frame of reference of our foreign aid program is too often military: How can we shore up our defense perimeter? How can we create military bastions that can withstand overt aggression? How can we help the underdeveloped nations to contribute to our policy of deterrence?

The United States budget figures speak eloquently. In fiscal year 1958, $3.3 billion were obligated or reserved through the Mutual Security Program. Of this amount, $1.9 was allocated for military assistance programs administered by the Department of Defense and only $1.4 for economic assistance administered by the International Cooperation Administration. This $1.4 allocation was broken down as follows: technical cooperation, $129 million; defense support, $778 million; special economic assistance, $225 million, and Development Loan Fund, $300 million. Of the $1.4 billion allocated for what is termed "economic assistance," well over half went for defense support, provided to help fourteen underdeveloped countries "maintain the necessary military forces without a disastrous strain upon their economies." Yet all of these countries also receive military assistance.

More and more people are now convinced that it is on the economic front that the real issues of the cold war will be fought out, and it is to that front that our foreign aid emphasis should be shifted. The establishment of the Development Loan Fund, to cite one specific example, is a step in the right direction; but allocations to it have been much too meager to make it nearly as effective as it might be.

If such a general shift in allocations can be made without jeopardizing our security, there is a way in which at least a sizable proportion of the increased funds for non-military assistance should be used. That is to give special attention to one large country for a full-scale demonstration of over-all development. Increasingly it is becoming obvious that this country should be India.

The Indian economy has been termed by John Kenneth Galbraith "the world's greatest example of functioning anarchy." Without question the primary effort in India is being directed toward finding an escape from the economy of want and laying a solid base for an economy of assured subsistence for its three hundred eighty million people—who are increasing at the rate of five million a year. There are those in India who believe that the passion for rapid industrialization has impeded progress toward this more primary goal. Recently, Mr. J.R.D. Tata, perhaps the top-ranking industrialist in India, made a statement to the effect that India would be wise to cease its attempt to build up the steel industry and direct all its resources for a time to small industry (consumer goods) and agricultural production.

The program to modernize India through a series of five-year plans started off auspiciously, and plenty of qualified observers have commented on the remarkable advances made in laying the base of a nationwide industrial organization, in increasing food production, and in loosening the stranglehold of what has been called "India's vast inertia." But the pace of advance has slowed down, due perhaps to the diminution of the pre- and post-independence period *élan,* to the geometrical multiplication of difficulties as the revolution to create a secular, socialist society moved ahead, to the drag of both right-wing and left-wing political movements, and most recently and immediately to the financial problems of the second five-year plan. It is possible that the financial difficulties have been partly met through the negotiations during and following the meeting of the World Bank in New Delhi in October.

WHATEVER the immediate status of the revolution in India, it is doubtful if we are yet convinced in this country that India is the country which has the highest possible priority for the concerted attention and help of the Western world. The rationale of this position was stated most persuasively by Walter Lippmann in one of the articles he wrote after his return from the Soviet Union. He said: "The Communists are expanding in Asia because they are demonstrating a way, at present the only obviously effective way, of raising quickly the power and the standard of living of a backward people. The only convincing answer to that must be a demonstration by the non-Communist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nations that there is another and more humane way to overcome the immemorial poverty and weakness of the Asian peoples.

"This demonstration can best be made in India, and there is little doubt in my mind that if we and our Western partners could underwrite and assure the success of Indian development, it would make a world of difference. It might be decisive in turning the tide. It would put an end to the enervating feeling of fatality and of inevitability, to the sense that Communism is the only wave of the future, that there is only one way of salvation and that the West is impotent and too lazy to do anything but let the future go by default."

But suppose that the technical strategist on our over-all foreign policy tells us we cannot, without jeopardizing our security, change the present allocations pattern in that part of our Mutual Security Program administered by the International Cooperation Administration—the $1.4 billion lumped under "economic assistance"? We then come to the most critical question. Are the American people willing to pay the price for a more effective foreign aid program? Would the American people support even modestly increased expenditures in order to underwrite the program for India as outlined above, designed to make that country a demonstration of free world goals?

A candid look at recent history hardly suggests an affirmative reply to these questions. For several years the foreign aid program has had tough sledding in Congress, and Administration requests have been regularly trimmed. Each spring a concentrated campaign by concerned citizens and non-governmental organizations appears necessary to insure the continuance of a program even at its present level.

Yet we should not sell the American people short. They responded to the expensive Marshall Plan almost with fervor. The Point Four concept they accepted with enthusiasm. Perhaps the real reason that the foreign aid program has been allowed to lag is that it has not been presented to the American people with conviction. Perhaps their latent sense of responsibility has not been stirred, but whose fault is this? Has lack of resourceful national leadership on the profound necessity of increased foreign aid on long-range terms resulted in the lackadaisical response by the people?

IT IS DOUBTLESS true that Americans are addicted to the private enjoyment of consumer goods at the expense of the public standard of living. Education, science and even adequate defense has consequently suffered. Yet only one who has utterly lost faith in the American people and indeed in the future of America would maintain that a more adequate foreign aid program would be rejected by our citizens—granting they were given half a chance to grasp fully its pivotal importance for an authentically free world at peace.

A modest increase in foreign aid expenditures might not seem out of line in view of the predictions for a record-breaking national income during this year. Total spending in the United States, it is estimated, will rise from a present $453 billion to $479.3 billion a year from now. During the same period personal incomes are expected to rise 20 billion and dividends for stockholders $2.5 billion.

It may be that we should aim to balance the national budget. But few would contend that this objective should override all others. "Mere parsimony is not economy," said Edmund Burke. "Expense, and great expense, may be essential part of true economy."

Increased expenditures for foreign aid directed toward the over-all development of uncommitted nations in today's world is "true economy." For if it is indeed true that the economic front is the crucial place where the cold war is now being fought, the foreign aid program can no longer be considered ancillary. It can contribute decisively to our struggle for two supreme ends: that a society of coercion shall not prevail and that a society of consent—a genuinely free world—shall not perish from the earth.

Underwriting the demonstration in India would be an eminently sound start on the development of a long-term, adequate foreign aid program. But even this small beginning, when viewed in conjunction with all our nation's other vast commitments, will require much of the American character. We shall need to make a greatly increased emphasis on the public standard of living as over against the private standard of living. We shall have to become more fully responsible in terms of what we have and what we are as a people.

Ponder in this context the words of former Ambassador Mehta: "Not merely an army but freedom itself nowadays marches on its stomach."

Tree at Guadalupe Church, Santa Fe

The tree of heaven, ailanthus, grows like weed;
is weed. It crowds out better trees
of more distinguished family, sheds its seed
in city yards; runs wild and does not please
tree fanciers; pleases itself; takes root;
survives wherever it finds a square of free
earth; scorns nowhere; fears nothing; thrives on
soot.
Where the seed falls it turns into a tree.
Grows here beside her church who chased away
the serpent; Rooted in sandy soil, it burns
bright panicles of flame against pure day-
light; soars up into the blue; turns
eyes toward heaven, turns eyes toward her who
came
among the crags: a tree of heaven all flame.

SISTER MARIS STELLA, C.S.J.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No longer is war presented as a simple conflict between right and wrong

The 'Enemy' on Film

by MARYVONNE BUTCHER

JUST BEFORE THE Brussels Exhibition closed, a large, impressive collection of film connoisseurs and critics were gathered together with the avowed purpose of choosing the twelve best films of all time; as if, as Claude Mauriac perspicaciously remarked, the cinema had in fact had any other time. They tried for some days, and in the end gave up the task as impossible; one cannot, after all, exalt chalk above cheese. What they did achieve, however, was a list of six films which they thought were masterpieces, and among these was Jean Renoir's *La Grande Illusion*. This, added to the fact that *La Grand Illusion* has been playing on the Paris boulevards for many weeks, in open competition with all the newest releases and has now opened in London too, has set me brooding on the way we have changed in our treatment of the enemy on the screen over the years.

Almost the first feature picture I ever saw was "The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse." What I chiefly remember about it, apart from Valentino's tango, which even at the age of twelve I had the sense to see was something rather special, is the great gross back of Wallace Beery as the German officer, soaping himself in a looted bath. One was ready, in those days, to believe anything bad of the Germans and this hulking lout seemed to be much what one might expect: it was easier to believe this was the enemy rather than one of the mild blond boys who had worked on our local farms towards the end of the war, or who arrived at the little station with wounds still bound in paper bandages, all that the German C.C.S. could provide in 1918. They had been, disturbingly, human beings; this ludicrous brute in his golden tub was a primitive stereotype of "the enemy," and as such far easier to grasp. As the years went by it all became much less clear-cut; the black less black, the white much less pure by 1930, when "All Quiet on the Western Front" and "Westfront 1918" came out, and a general mist of grey began to creep over the confused picture of the war that lay so far behind us. It became clear, at least, that it certainly had not been fought to end wars. So that by the mid-thirties, when I saw Jean Renoir's great picture in Paris, a great illusion was indeed what war seemed to be.

Renoir's film—one of the best that even he has ever made—set out to demonstrate that war was not a a simple conflict of opposing forces, one right (us) the other wrong (the enemy), that propaganda would so dearly like to establish. Not so, says Renoir, as he shows us the inmates of his prison camp: war cannot at all easily destroy the innate sympathies that lie between people of similar tastes and backgrounds. Although they are on different sides, the German officer played by Erich von Stroheim and the young French officer played by Pierre Fresnay have more in common than it is convenient to admit. And so with the other ranks. It is, as Robert Graves describes in *Goodbye to All That,* only with difficulty that a belligerent spirit between combatants can be maintained when nothing in particular is happening. Once you begin to think of your enemy as just another man, it is hard to remember that you must kill him, and harder still to remember to hate him continuously. After Stroheim killed Fresnay, in the heat of an emergency, it is with real emotion and affection that he lays his last flower on the coffin. "For my enemy is dead, a man as divine as myself is dead," wrote Whitman, and this is very much the mood of Renoir's masterpiece; it suits well with the mood of today, too, when almost everyone has had some part in the war, and very few have come out with any illusion intact.

IN FACT, of course, very few even went into the second world war with any illusions, and it was, moreover, a war in which sympathies could not be divided into compartments. There were Fascists in every nation, just as there were men on the other side who could bring little or no allegiance to the monomaniacs who determined the official policies. This, in itself, meant that the treatment of the enemy could not be so cut and dried, even in art, as it had been in the earlier, less complicated days. During the war, in the free countries, films were either escapist or propagandist as required; in the occupied countries pictures were made as they could be: the collaborators collaborated on propaganda, the non-collaborators went to prison

Miss Butcher, a British film critic, writes for *Blackfriars* and the London *Tablet*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or turned to fantasy, to history, to allegory—to anything, in short, which did not treat of the intolerable present in the permitted terms.

It is not, I think, particularly useful to examine the films actually made during the war if we want to see how the treatment of the enemy has evolved, because no one—however free—was free enough then to treat the subject with detachment. It is more rewarding to analyze films made in the post-war period, and in particular three films which give special national attitudes to this problem of the enemy-concept. Of "The Young Lions," "The Bridge Over the River Kwai" and *"Un Condamné à Mort s'est Echappé"* two are very good and one is a masterpiece, and they do, in a way, give a fair idea of how Americans, Englishmen and Frenchmen have tackled the theme.

These three films were made from books and, as is almost inevitable, the books suffered some adjustment in the process. This adjustment was particularly acute in the case of "The Young Lions," and indeed this film, which evoked the loudest outcry, did radically distort the original standpoint of the author. It has been reported that Marlon Brando went to see Irwin Shaw in Paris, to explain how they were to change the character of Christian Diestl, and asked him whether, if he were writing the book today, he would paint Diestl in the same colors. Shaw replied "I wouldn't change it much. This is the breed that killed 20,000,000 people, and the people are still dead." In spite of this, Brando went ahead with his interpretatrait of a much more human person; less cruel more muddled and, at the close, in the place of Shaw's unregenerate Nazi's unregenerate end, a man who is totally disillusioned. And whatever the original aim of their picture may have been, there is no doubt that Brando is the hero of "The Young Lions" and it is for him that we weep at the close, not for Montgomery Clift as we should. We are left with a dying fall, with the feeling that

Cut is the branch that might have grown full straight,
And burned is Apollo's laurel-bough

The golden boy is the tragic hero of this intelligent, accomplished film, and nobody else, as he very well knows, has a chance against his charm, his skill, his looks and the implication of his essential decency.

AND YET, one must ask: is this the film which should have been made out of this book and by this American team? One could just stomach such an opportune attack of invincible ignorance from a German director—not that there is one in Germany at the moment who would dare to make such a film—but coming from a nation which saw the concentration camps at first hand its approach is so far from being candid, it flourishes its *suppressio veri* and its *suggestio falsi* with such deliberation, that one is left feeling that it is almost more dangerous than some chauvinistic outburst in the other direction. One has the uneasy feeling that this is less a sincere gesture towards international goodwill than a successful attempt to get the best of practically all possible film worlds. Be that as it may, one thing at least is certain; it could hardly have been made in 1928.

"The Bridge over the River Kwai" was made by a British director, from a French novel, with a predominantly British cast, and produced by an American company; it is legitimate to think of it, broadly speaking, as a British picture, for I fancy it would have been very different if directed by an American. It deals with the ambiguous situation produced by the confrontation of two excessively diehard soldiers in a Japanese prison camp—the Japanese commandant and the British colonel. They are both of that indurated military type that is brave, devoted, bigoted and narrow to the point of madness. Each, as they privately assert, considers the other man to be in fact mad for demonstrating precisely those qualities they have in common.

This picture outraged many Englishmen who had fought in the Far East or suffered under the Japanese as prisoners of war. I speak with some knowledge, since it happened that our local regiment, which was full of boys whom one had always known, was taken prisoner almost *in toto* after the fall of Singapore, and they commented in no uncertain fashion when the film reached our home town. For if the Commandant, played by Sessue Hayakawa, is cruel, obstinate and a military maniac, then Colonel Nicholson in Alec Guinness's wonderful portrayal, is much the same and if anything, even madder. What was strongly felt by the returned prisoners of war was that though their own officers might very well have been as brave and eccentric as Colonel Nicholson, with his determination to show the Japs that we were better men than they were, even if this meant aiding their war effort, yet that the bestial cruelty of the Japs in charge of prison camps was, almost universally, of a kind that should have permitted of no comparison between them as human beings. They felt that it would have been totally impossible for Nicholson and the Commandant to find common ground, even of a military kind: it seemed to them a massive betrayal of their own sufferings and the deaths of uncounted comrades that the Japanese should be shown in this way.

ROBERT BRESSON'S *"Un Condamné à Mort s'est Echappé"* is a film of much higher caliber than either of the other two; it is in fact one of those rare pieces of work that affirm the cinema to be an art and not merely an industry. It deals in a supremely intellectual way with the problem of what goes on inside a man's head when he is totally in the enemy's power and yet totally refuses to acknowledge defeat. It is a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

film, as indeed are almost all Bresson's, of the utmost interiority. Consequently the problem of the enemy, in a film in which he is enormously important both as a fact and as a concept, is solved by hardly presenting him in the flesh at all. We see a few Germans played, in a film in which no professional actor appears, by German students at the University of Paris, but their physical appearance is minimal and the effect this physical appearance makes is far less emphatic than the many oblique references and suggestions by which the whole climate of occupation is conveyed.

Fontaine, the condemned man, escapes or tries to. He is recaptured and savagely beaten up but we see only the results of this—his bloodstained, filthy shirt; his bruised face; his stiff and pain-racked movements. He is hurled into a cell and collapses into what should be despair; but visibly we see first resistance and then fortitude flowering in his battered body, and the rest of the film is the epic of his long, cunning and exhausting preparations for escape, with the actual break-out forming the breathless climax.

The Germans are omnipresent, but hardly at all as people. They are there as the shadow of a sten-gun on a wall, as the rattle of keys on bars, as the stamp of boots, as shouted orders, as the hand that shoves in the food or bolts the door. German soldiers are the authors of all the suffering, the fear, the death in the crowded Lyons prison, but no comment is made on them, either by Fontaine or by Bresson. They are coldly, clearly presented as the instruments of oppression and conquest: they are absolutely "other": but they are not judged. When Fontaine is taken off to Gestapo H.Q. for his final interview, this neutrality of presentation becomes almost sympathetic, but with characteristic irony the result of this German correctness is simply that Fontaine's death sentence is confirmed. His luck holds, however, and he is returned to the same cell; and the dubious scruffy boy who is thrown in to share it with him, who might so easily be a traitor, turns out to be the ultimate reason why their dual escape succeeds. During the long, agonizing passages of the break-out, Fontaine has to kill a German sentry, but this is done without any emotive aids at all; he shows no anger, the Mozart music rises to no climax—the sentry is simply methodically suppressed and we move on to drop over the next obstacle.

It is hardly possible, I think, to deal more dispassionately with an enemy than Bresson has done here; and it is well to remember that he is dealing not with an enemy but with *the* enemy; that he has lived through two wars and been a prisoner in the second in which everything dear to a Frenchman was violated by the Germans. France's third German war brought with it a loss of honor both moral and psychological that can never, I am persuaded, be understood by those of us fortunate enough to have escaped actual occupation. No one could fail to understand what being a Frenchman under occupation was like after seeing this film, since every action of Fontaine and his friends make it clinically apparent; but the conclusion that Bresson leaves us to draw is that the spirit of man proves its invincibility through the preservation of its integrity, not through the cultivation of a snarling hate for the enemy.

But this preservation of integrity requires a recognition of the enemy for what he intrinsically is: something alien, a kind of occasion of sin, something like the incarnation of the dragon that all champions of the good must meet and overcome before their dark journey can be completed. There is no doubt, I feel, that of these three films *"Un Condamné"* is the greatest, the most objective, the most valuable for anyone trying to work out in terms of life as well as of cinema what one's personal, moral assessment of the enemy should be. It is not surprising that the most intelligent approach to the problem should be French; what is more surprising, perhaps, is that it is the most magnanimous. Bresson sees his Nazis for what they are and can still contrive to present them with detachment as not more than incidental factors in Fontaine's humble battle for the citadel of his interior integrity.

WE HAVE gone a long way and learned too much about ourselves to dismiss the enemy as arbitrarily as the Germans were dismissed in "The Four Horsemen"; we realize now that he is human as we are and often caught in the net of the same unjust necessity. One of the very best presentations of this situation that the cinema has shown was America's matchless *A Time Out of War,* which perhaps because it was in truth treating of a civil war, made explicit that men could be brothers and yet divided by forces stranger than themselves within them as well as without.

At the same time it should not be forgotten that the mere fact that there is an enemy predicates some great gulf of principle between the two sides of the struggle. There must, necessarily, be in every war something of that warfare described by St. Paul to the Ephesians, "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Without some convictions of righteousness the spirit of man sickens, and he will not fight; paradox therefore besets the Christian at war, as paradox too often besets the Christian, and he must contrive as best he may to love his cause and yet not hate his enemy personally; and every war is in some sort a civil war, since it must be against our brothers. It behooves us, therefore, to do our best to present our enemy with justice as well as with charity, to avoid distortion of a situation already more complicated than we can bear.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senator Kennedy and His Critics

TWO WEEKS AGO under the title "A Catholic for President?" we published our own editorial comment on Senator Kennedy's Church-State position as reported in a recent issue of Look. *In view of wide public interest and the importance of the subject, we are here presenting significant excerpts from opinion in the Catholic press on Senator Kennedy's remarks. The full text of his statement as quoted in* Look *appears on the following page. Further comment by us may be found on page 635.* THE EDITORS.

AMERICA

Article XI, para. 3 of the Constitution serenely declares that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." If the Founding Fathers, at a time when the "pretensions" of Rome were vividly present to Protestant minds, saw no reason why a Catholic could not conscientiously serve the public, what has happened since then to change things?

Sen. John F. Kennedy, in his March 3 *Look* interview, submitted himself, in effect, to such a religious test. We hope, not too confidently, that it is the last of its kind. We do not agree with the magazine's statement that, in the forthcoming campaign, "a Catholic candidate would have to give his views on his religion." This kind of cross-examination, directed as it is solely to Catholics, as Catholics, is discriminatory, insulting and without pertinence in terms of the U. S. Constitution.

Our own reaction to the controverted *Look* interview is one of impatience at the earnest Massachusetts Senator's efforts to appease bigots, rather than of disagreement with the positive points he made. A Catholic political candidate, if he must make a profession of his faith, should not seem to give quarter to religious bigotry, even at the risk of having his words distorted. We were somewhat taken aback, for instance, by the unvarnished statement that "whatever one's religion in his private life . . . nothing takes precedence over his oath. . . ." Mr. Kennedy doesn't really believe that. No religious man, be he Catholic, Protestant or Jew, holds such an opinion. A man's conscience has a bearing on his public as well as his private life. . . .

The Democratic Senator from Massachusetts took a carefully formulated stand on the issue of Federal aid to education. But here again, we wish he had thought as much of his fellow Catholics as of his potential non-Catholic critics. He is against Federal aid to Catholic schools, except for "fringe" benefits. In this, his position is not much different from that of such authoritative churchmen as Cardinal Spellman and Cardinal Cushing. But these prelates' renunciations in the interest of good will cannot and do not erase the inherent inequity of which Catholics feel they are the victims. The issue is not a "religious" one, nor a "socio-economic" one, but rather an elementary question of equal treatment under the law. In the years to come, Catholics are confident that a fair-minded public, and the Supreme Court itself, will finally recognize that the theoretical right of a sizable proportion of U. S. citizens to maintain their own schools is not a right at all when coupled with a denial of the necessary means.

We regret that Senator Kennedy, in his sweeping statement opposing Federal aid, did not think it appropriate to add his tribute to the enormous sacrifices that millions of his fellow Catholic citizens are making for their schools, or to the contribution these sacrifices mean to the moral and spiritual strength of the nation. On the part of one who himself never went to a Catholic school, such a gesture would have been as gracious as it was obviously called for.

AVE MARIA

"Whatever one's religion in his private life may be," says Senator Kennedy, "for the officeholder, nothing takes precedence over his oath to uphold the Constitution and all its parts—including the First Amendment and the strict separation of church and state."

. . . . Senator Kennedy is entitled to his opinion, which we believe is shared by many, but in our opinion such thinking contains a serious flaw. Something does indeed take precedence over the obligation to uphold the Constitution—namely, conscience. And this applies whatever the religion of the officeholder. No man may rightfully act against his conscience. To relegate your conscience to your "private life" is not only unrealistic, but dangerous as well.

It is dangerous because it leads to secularism in public life. It is the political version of the belief that religion has nothing to say about the conduct of economic affairs, that you can separate your private religious convictions from everyday life. And this is unrealistic in public life where it is necessary to make all kinds of decisions based on your moral and religious

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

values. President Truman's decision to drop the atomic bomb on Hiroshima is a classic example. . . .

And it is not beyond the realm of possibility that the President elected in 1960 may well have to decide whether or not to instruct our Air Force to engage in obliteration bombing of a foe which has delivered a sneak attack against us. Can we realistically say that this decision may be reached apart from a President's "private" religious beliefs?

Then there is the matter of separation of Church and State. Stated as a general principle, it is a sound one. Both the Church and the State are perfect societies capable of achieving their own ends—one natural, the other supernatural. And we know of no priest or Bishop who would want to see our government run by the clergy.

General principles are safe enough and we can sympathize with the harried politician trying to be all things to all men who falls back on them. Senator Kennedy, however, becomes more specific. . . .

We agree with the Senator's careful phrasing about the use of federal funds: "It's unconstitutional under the First Amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court." But this is not the real issue, for the Supreme Court can—and has—reversed itself. We believe that a legitimate question can be asked of *any* candidate—Do *you* believe that the Supreme Court's decision was a wise and fair one? Does it do justice to those American citizens who, for reasons of conscience, choose to send their children to religious schools? Or are they being unfairly penalized for exercising freedom of religion? . . .

Senator Kennedy's Statements

"Whatever one's religion in his private life may be, for the officeholder, nothing takes precedence over his oath to uphold the Constitution and all its parts—including the First Amendment and the strict separation of Church and State. Without reference to the Presidency, I believe as a Senator that the separation of Church and State is fundamental to our American concept and heritage and should remain so.

"I am flatly opposed to appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican. Whatever advantages it might have in Rome—and I'm not convinced of these—they would be more than offset by the divisive effect at home.

"The First Amendment to the Constitution is an infinitely wise one. There can be no question of Federal funds being used for support of parochial or private schools. It's unconstitutional under the First Amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court. I'm opposed to the Federal Government's extending support to sustain any Church or its schools. As for such fringe matters as buses, lunches, and other services, the issue is primarily social and economic and not religious. Each case must be judged on its merits within the law as interpreted by the courts."

—*Look, March 3, 1959*

CATHOLIC MESSENGER
Davenport, Iowa

I read with considerable dismay the article on Catholics and the Presidency in *Look* magazine this week. The dismay was occasioned by the statements on Church and State relations attributed to Senator John Kennedy of Massachusetts. But, of course, the trouble with criticizing Senator Kennedy's "strict separation" position is that the critic may, in turn, be accused of wanting a union of Church and State in this country.

I doubt whether very many, if any, Catholics want anything approaching a theocracy in this country. But I do not see why the Senator feels it necessary to go to the other extreme and interpret the First Amendment to the Constitution to mean "strict separation of Church and State." I realize that the usual protective coloring of a political candidate is ambiguity of expression. But in the interest of clarity, if not political expedience, I should like the Senator to define what he means by "strict separation." The only meaning we can place on his language at this moment is that he is in favor of absolute separation, the 'high and impregnable' wall.

Now, despite the fact that people like Paul Blanshard and Glenn Archer and John Mackay insist that absolute separation of Church and State is the meaning and intent of the First Amendment, such separation has never existed in this country. Church and State make contact at many points in American life and the contact is not one of conflict but of collaboration. The State pays chaplains in our armed forces and in our prisons; it provides chapels at taxpayers' expenses; it furnishes tax-supported government surplus foods at below-cost prices on the Federal school lunch program; and negatively it exempts religious institutions from certain property and excise taxes.

These are not concessions grudgingly wrung out of government by any religious pressure groups. They are the common-sense adjustments of Church and State in situations where Church and State have a mutual interest and concern. Obviously this is not "strict separation" of Church and State and it is unpleasant to see a Catholic Senator in the awkward position of bending over backwards as he tries to "prove" his loyalty to the American Constitution.

He is apparently willing to go further in the direc-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of "separation" than what non-Catholic Constitutional scholars and the whole American tradition say is necessary or desirable. . . . DONALD MCDONALD.

CATHOLIC REVIEW
Baltimore, Maryland

One of the things which has struck me about the comment on the Kennedy statements is that almost all Catholic and secular writers have accepted the fact that Senator Kennedy needed to express his allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, and that above all else, Protestants must be satisfied.

But the obvious question to be asked is "why?" We do not ask the Baptist President or the Presbyterian President, or the Episcopalian President, a Lutheran President, or a Mormon President, to declare his stand on the Constitution or the First Amendment to it.

The Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State (P.O.A.U.) have not requested a statement of loyalty to the Constitution from Agricultural Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, who is also a Mormon bishop. . . . Unfortunately, despite lessening of tensions in many areas, a Catholic President is something quite a number of bigots still can't stomach. These bigots question the loyalty of a Catholic Presidential candidate, solely on religious grounds, and with a belligerency unbecoming of any professed believers in God.

The P.O.A.U. never seems to be worried about the dangers of subversion or disloyalty from Catholics in the Armed Forces. They reason that Catholics can loyally die for their country in Korea, Europe, or Timbuktu. They don't mind Catholics paying taxes, but they do mind Catholic children getting free school bus rides, free lunches or health services out of State or Federal taxation. . . . They reason that an American Catholic owes allegiance to a foreign power, i.e. the Vatican. It is a lot of poppycock, of course, and the argument has been demolished time and time again. However, the P.O.A.U. persists in resurrecting the bogey every time it possibly can. . . . One of the things that bothers me in relation to Mr. Kennedy is that he appears to have gone overboard, in an effort to placate the bigots. . . . GERARD E. SHERRY.

KANSAS CITY—ST. JOSEPH REGISTER
Kansas City, Missouri

. . . The Senator's statement [". . . nothing takes precedence over his oath . . ."] suggests that a man who accepts office in the United States is no longer the keeper of his own conscience. If this is American doctrine, I'm leaving for Tahiti.

For, as another critic has pointed out, the Kennedy statement expresses fundamentally the same doctrine as the one used by Nazi torturers and assassins in the Nuremberg trials. They argued that they could not be convicted of any crimes because they had acted in obedience to duly constituted superiors and the "law of the land."

It is conceivable, if not likely, that an American Congress might pass a law over the President's veto which would require him to do something he regards as seriously evil. This could happen to any President, Catholic, Protestant or Jewish; and the Constitution would require him to carry out the will of Congress. Should he obey, Mr. Kennedy? I know how most Protestants and Jews—and agnostics, for that matter—would answer that, and how a Catholic should. . . .

There are several things to be said about [the statement on federal aid to private or parochial schools]:

1. There is no Catholic "dogma" on the Constitutional aspects of tax aid to religious schools. If a Catholic believes that such aid is imprudent or illegal, he is not therefore less Catholic.

2. There is, however, a position widely held among Catholics which differs from Senator Kennedy's. . . . As things now stand, Catholics, besides contributing to the support of public schools, simultaneously support a separate system which serves the public interest but without receiving public support. And it seems that a right is substantially denied if it can be exercised only by paying a severe penalty. . . .

3. In the light of these circumstances, the objection to Senator Kennedy's statement is that it simply ignores the complexity of the issue. Reading it, one would suppose that Catholics who argue for tax aid do so out of contempt for the Constitution. Senator Kennedy's statement of the issue is so one-sided that you don't even get a hint that other sides exist.

Now, this is not typical of Mr. Kennedy's usual style in political debate. He is fully capable of stating an issue in all its complexity without weakening his final conclusion. Hence, in this case one gets the distinct impression that he is not so much trying to weigh the question fairly as he is using the question to demonstrate his independence. . . .

4. A minor point, but I think a significant one: To say that the issue of "fringe benefits" is "primarily social and economic and not religious" is sloppy in logic and language. The *benefits* are social and economic, but the issue is obviously political. That is, it has to do with justice: Should children who attend Catholic schools be therefore disqualified from receiving health and welfare services supplied by the government to all other children? . . .

Some people believe—or say they believe—that a Catholic ought not to be elected President because his religion might conflict with his duties. On the assumption that Mr. Kennedy does want to be President, he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has to try to persuade such people that this fear has no basis.

There are two ways of doing this. One way would be to show that the Catholic religion in no way conflicts with the Constitution and does not subordinate political leaders to ecclesiastical control. This is difficult because it is always difficult to prove a negative statement. But it can be done. . . .

The other way of allaying these alleged fears is to publicly subordinate one's religious faith to the requirements of political office; to assert that, although there may be conflict between an officeholder's convictions and his constitutional duties, he should place the duties of office above the obligations of his religious commitment.

Such groveling is not required of Baptists, Presbyterians, Christian Scientists, or Quakers, all of whom hold religious convictions which might easily affect their political activities. I don't believe it is required of Catholics either.

Nevertheless, it would appear—though not with absolute clarity—that Senator Kennedy has chosen this second course. . . .

ROBERT HOYT.

INDIANA CATHOLIC AND RECORD
Indianapolis, Ind.

Young Senator Kennedy had better watch his language. His much publicized statements in *Look* magazine have set Catholics to fighting among themselves. This is not good—in this instance at least—for it could confirm some folks in their fears that a Catholic can not in conscience uphold the Constitution. . . .

Quite rightly Catholic editors took exception to Senator Kennedy's unhappy phrasing. When a man starts making a distinction between religion in "private life" and as an "officeholder," he seems to be thinking like a secularist who wants religion totally separated from life. *Ave Maria,* the well-edited Catholic weekly published by the Holy Cross Fathers at Notre Dame, picked up Mr. Kennedy's words immediately. "Something does indeed take precedence over the obligation to uphold the Constitution — namely, conscience," the editors write. "To relegate your conscience to your 'private life' is not only unrealistic, but dangerous as well."

The *Ave Maria* editors were not so happy in their own phrasing. A Catholic who swears to uphold the Constitution, like anyone else, is bound by his conscience to uphold it. Therefore to say "Something does indeed take precedence over the obligation to uphold the Constitution—namely, conscience," makes nonsense. . . .

Ave Maria very correctly points out that the President elected in 1960 may have to make decisions affecting hundreds of thousands of lives and that some of these decisions will involve moral questions. But, it is misleading to imply that such a man will be torn between two opposed duties—a duty to uphold the Constitution and a duty to make his decisions conform to his religious principles.

Ave Maria is justly critical of some other parts of Mr. Kennedy's statements. The Senator is perfectly free to advocate whatever policies he chooses in regard to Federal aid to private schools and fringe benefits for parochial students, like bus rides, text books, etc. It is hardly fair, however, to say that an oath to uphold the Constitution would oblige a Catholic to maintain the extreme secularist interpretation of the First Amendment. A theory about the Constitution is not the Constitution. . . .

ST. LOUIS REVIEW
St. Louis, Missouri

Whether quoted correctly or not, whether quoted as fully as he would like to be or not, Senator John F. Kennedy is reported to have said in the *Look* article, "Whatever one's religion in his private life may be, for the officeholder, nothing takes precedence over his oath to uphold the Constitution and all its parts—including the first Amendment and the strict separation of Church and state."

It seems to us that the element so vocal in its suspicion of a Catholic candidate for a major office welcomes much more a statement of this kind than it does a direct answer to the questions it proposed to Catholic candidates some months ago.

Nothing could be more acceptable to their crusade to cast a cloud of sinister doubt about the Catholic candidate than the inference that he is willing to keep his religious convictions in his back pocket while he is in public office—the further inference being that his Catholicism and the Constitution are at odds. If this were true, no Catholic candidate would deserve the vote of anyone, Catholic included.

The Catholic does not have to put his religion aside if he runs for or holds public office. He does not have to assure anyone that he will not let it interfere with his duty to his government because it never will. If he doesn't favor federal grants in certain areas that is his privilege; if he doesn't favor appointing an ambassador to the Vatican for cogent reasons of his own that is his privilege, and it doesn't make him any more or any less a Catholic. But when he infers that his religion which teaches him to know, love and serve God above all things and to love his neighbor as himself will not be allowed to interfere with his oath to the Constitution, it is the Constitution that ought to be examined, not his religion. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CATHOLIC FOR PRESIDENT?—I

IT WOULD BE foolhardy for a Catholic Presidential candidate not to make his position on Church-State questions clear. One who would take the advice of those Catholic editorialists who urge such a candidate to greet enquiries with a stony silence because they are discriminatory and insulting would be left with his dignity perhaps, but with precious little else. Let us grant that such questions put only to Catholic candidates do bear the stain of discrimination. Still, the fact is many Americans of good will have special concerns about having a Catholic for President.

These concerns, for them at least, are genuine; the candidate, it seems to me, has a duty to acknowledge their existence. I cannot agree that his doing so amounts to accepting a religious test for public office.

If a member of the P.O.A.U. were running for public office, I know I would want certain assurances before I went to the polls. I would not have the slightest interest in the theological beliefs of such a candidate, but I would be mighty concerned to know whether or not he intended, in his public role, to act on P.O.A.U. principles in the Church-State area and whether his concept of democracy was that which can be found in Mr. Blanshard's books.

Now many well-meaning members of P.O.A.U. may be shocked by this flat statement. It may never have occurred to them to think that there are Americans like me who oppose the P.O.A.U. because they sincerely feel that the political philosophy expressed by the organization is a threat to liberty and its neo-Jacobin notion of American democracy contains the seeds of totalitarianism. Such persons might even be insulted by my remarks, for undoubtedly they see themselves as the foremost of patriots. I would be sorry if their feelings were hurt. I certainly do not intend to wound them. Moreover, I do not question their earnestness. However I do question P.O.A.U. principles and the wisdom of its members, and if one of them were running for high office, I should expect him to offer me a number of reassurances if he wanted my vote.

A Presidential candidate is asking all the people to let him be their servant as well as their ruler. It is not becoming then for him to strike a lofty attitude when the people, or some of them, take steps to assure themselves that he will rule them and serve them as they wish to be ruled and served. To do this, they may have to ask some delicate questions. Some of them may even betray their historic fears and ancient prejudices. They may, by such a betrayal, wound the feelings of those who are the object of these fears and this prejudice. Catholics, for instance, may have their feelings hurt when it is publicly brought home to them that they are still not quite trusted. I know that in my own life the evidence that this is so—which only a dolt could miss—never fails to sting. But feeling the sting is the price the Catholic still has to pay for participation in public life. It is at once too early and too late to be "insulted" by it.

So let us say that a Catholic candidate may properly be asked questions which would either be unnecessary or gratuitous in the case of another candidate. What kind of questions are proper, what kind insolent? For there is a difference. The matter of applying a religious test for office does have some meaning. I take it that when that provision was originally drafted, its authors had in mind a test for theological orthodoxy of one kind or another. Such questions are clearly improper. In our government, what one believes about the great theological questions—whether there is a God, Who He is, what He is, the Redemption, the meaning of history, etc.—is in a very real sense a "private" matter. That is not to say that the American system canonizes an individualistic, personalistic concept of Christian theology. It does not even canonize Christianity. It is to say, though, that the religious beliefs of a political leader are his "private" affair and that he should feel no obligation, as a political leader, to make these beliefs public.

The political beliefs of a leader, however, are decidedly a matter of public interest. He has a duty to inform the public about them. The public has a right, if not an obligation, to know what they are.

The special problem arises when "public" political beliefs are thought to derive necessarily from "private" religious views. Then inevitably the electorate looks at the "private" views which they think will control the "public" views. If it is felt—as some people feel about Catholic candidates—that because they hold this or that "private" view they will inevitably hold a consequent "public" view, certain political questions become a serious concern.

These factors, I think, are behind the distinction Senator Kennedy made between his private religious views and public political views. In making such a distinction, he was in effect denying that the supposed relationship is as predictable as many Americans seem to believe it is. The lectures he received in the Catholic papers the next week on the primacy of conscience were largely beside the point. He was not denying the primacy of conscience. He was saying, as I understood him, that there is no necessary conflict between his conscience—or the conscience of any American Catholic—and the Constitution of the United States.

JOHN COGLEY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STAGE

THE MANDARIN PASSION

IN THE "Rashomon," with its stiffened ceremonial texture, its archaic legend of violence and intent of harsh irony, with, not least of all, this variousness of manner, racial impulse and tone it must compel to some final unity, the theater art takes on an intricate, perhaps an overwhelming ambition. The singularity of the event is only accentuated by its uniquely reversed passage from screen to stage, and indeed, Mr. Harold Clurman has wondered publicly why the whole enterprise need have been undertaken. Had I seen the film, I might join in such an inquiry, but as it stands, the "Rashomon" presence seems to me—and to comparable novices, I do not doubt—a vivid animation among our pallors, and by its engagement of energies of style and mind, more pertinent to the uses of theater than many a success of lower, however amiable, pressure.

Stylization, and not the merely decorative, so Mr. William Dunlea remarked in these pages only a fortnight ago, continues to be the hallmark of Japanese artistry: "a way of feeling as well as ordering." The conventions of Oriental esthetic, the conditions under which it would represent reality—tactility and singleness of effect, attention to pattern, the purity of the discriminated image—do not differ radically from the fundamental laws of all art; it is only the Western imagination, with its taste—some might say barbaric taste—for riot and abundance which may find them straitening.

Yet in the short stories of a writer such as Akutagawa—from two of which the play has been contrived—the constant paradox of high Japanese art is to be seen, for the living matter of this vision is passionate, vile, merciless: only the form is mandarin. On the chaos of "Rashomon," as an instance, on this substance of murder, rape, mutual egotisms and self-enhancement, Akutagawa turns an oblique glance, yet when he takes up acid to etch the scene, so potent is the contrast of its great heat and his natural coldness—and so necessary the dualism—that one is conscious of an impeccable and sophisticated master.

Mr. and Mrs. Michael Kanin would not seem, on the face of it, an ideal medium for the translation of such qualities, and they cause one no surprise. To the stage "Rashomon," they contribute the blunt narrative of Akutagawa's design, together with a tedious finale of bourgeois moralism, and a language markedly banal. As often as not, this last defeats the considerable stylistic assumptions of the players: no one, for example, could ever be taken quite seriously who must announce, "I will go with you and be your woman." What was clearly indicated, I should say, in this particular dramatic problem, was a speech close to the rhythm and austerity of *haiku,* of the *Noh* plays or the Arthur Waley translations, but how far such an enterprise would lie outside our racial tradition, who can doubt?

An alternative would be dumbshow, and the clever Mr. Peter Glenville has contrived for the play images of a superb fanaticism, fiery and gorgeous with a kind of aristocratic brutality: the samurai and the bandit in glistening, feral combat; Miss Claire Bloom's lovely mask, milky and impassive beneath its swathed veils; the reddened mouth of a medium contorted over a sulphurous brazier of coals. Within the budding grove of Mr. Oliver Messel's decor, viscous with greenery and malignant fronds, and washed by a light so pellucid as to seem the very waiting breath of time, such moments are not to be effaced. They have a consciousness of manner, an intent of artifice about them, which is a distinguished though not a supreme virtue in the theatrical faculty. What they attempt is not that approximation of the Japanese mode Mr. Clurman finds wanting, but rather an experiment in stylization: an attempt to translate motifs of alien life and art into the texture of one's own theater style. Thus Mr. Rod Steiger's bandit would be intolerable as mimicry of a Japanese actuality, but as the American comment on that, is intelligible, persuasive and dominating. I agree that such removal from an immediate substance of reality diminishes a work's intimacy and attack; equally I would claim that "Rashomon," with its considerable conviction of artificial style, suggests one way—and to my mind the most satisfactory—of how to represent an alien culture in terms of theater: by not insisting on it.

That the stylistic—which is to say, the imaginative—triumph is incomplete is to be seen in Mr. Glenville's scandalous failure with the play's crowning irony: that illumination of egotism, cowardice and vacancy, which he has directed in his accustomed farce manner, and to such outrageous emotional fraudulence that it is received by the audience with coldness and visible hostility. For "Rashomom" touches profundity only in its ultimate idea, only by its thrust into the Pirandello country of man lacerated and sustained by illusion. Had Mr. Glenville truly measured the penetration of that insight, he would have imposed on this last scene a moral ferocity, a dark zest of sheer knowledge such as floods the terrible moments in Pirandello's "Right You Are" before the veiled woman is compelled to disclose her identity.

Yet of this even, may one be entirely certain? I was startled to remark, in the original Akutagawa story, how he omits the final "explanation"—allows the three dissident realities to remain intact in their sea of contradiction. He makes, as it were, a philosophic, not a moral point. As tragic comment, as mind, as passion, that point is vastly inferior to the Pirandello theme, with its generous torment of being, its intimations of im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mutability and compassionate love. As philosophy, it is perhaps more humane than the testament of this stage "Rashomon," so annihilating in its cynicism of value. As art, the whole has something of the nullity of, say, Maupassant, who followed his sense of life neither into light, nor to the dreadful ends of the earth, but allowed it rather to rest in the simple function of its nature. The question of why Akutagawa was content within the philosophic order, while we must extend him to the moral, I offer to the fledgling flocks of Buddhists, who fill the noonday air, and the midnight bars, with their crew-cut clamor of *zen ho!* *(At the Music Box.)*

RICHARD HAYES.

THE SCREEN

IN THE REIGN OF ALPHONSE I

AFTER THE final scenes of "Al Capone," showing the infamous gangster being maltreated by fellow inmates at Alcatraz, viewers will admit they've seen a well-made movie, but they may wonder *why* it was made. The film follows the career of Alphonse Capone, more often known as Al or Scarface, from his 1920 arrival in Chicago, where he works for Johnny Torrio learning the speakeasy and bootlegging business, through the killings and evil machinations in the corrupt city, to his rise as top mobster and to his fall not as punishment for his major crimes but for income tax evasion. If the picture has any moral it is that voters get pretty much what they deserve and that bad laws lead to demoralization and crime.

Thanks to the realistic Burrows-Ackerman production and the excellent direction of Richard Wilson, "Al Capone" is particularly successful in recreating this incredible contempt-for-law period in American history. At times the film is overly violent and bloody, but it probably does not exaggerate the facts. Although the good script by Malvin Wald and Henry Greenberg doesn't delve into backgrounds or explain what makes a man become a gangster (except for the general laxity and political corruption of the period), the characterizations are carefully done and are extremely well acted.

Discarding his stylized techniques, Rod Steiger gives his best film performance to date as Capone, the ruthless man who is frequently shocking and repulsive, occasionally intelligent and sometimes even sensitive—about his scarred face and in the courtship of the widow of one of his victims. Fay Spain plays this role well and director Wilson never allows sentiment to interfere with the picture's hard point of view; but most of the scenes involving her are as hard to believe

A Lovely Easter Book for Children

DONKEY'S GLORY

By NAN GOODALL

Illustrated by Sylvia Green

This beautiful, gentle, and reverent story of three little donkeys in Palestine who played important, if humble, roles in the life of Jesus, reaches its climax with the Lord's entry into Jerusalem before His crucifixion. With its charming illustrations *Donkey's Glory* is a gift for Eastertide that boys and girls from eight to twelve will cherish.

"In the gentle spirit of Saint Francis, this narrative uses the device of innocent animal devotion to give a full child's life of Jesus." —*Virginia Kirkus' Bulletin* $3.00

DAVID McKAY COMPANY, INC.
119 West 40th St., New York 18, N.Y.

THE CATHOLIC WORKER
March, 1959

Arrest of Act Two Members
AN EDITORIAL

On Pilgrimage
DOROTHY DAY

In the Market Place
AMMON HENNACY

Subscription 25¢ per year. Foreign 80¢. Bundle orders, 10 or more copies, 1¢ per copy plus postage.
Free Sample Copy on Request

The Catholic Worker
CAnal 6-9504
39 Spring Street New York 12, N.Y.

MARYGROVE
may be the COLLEGE for YOU.
Why not find out?
Address the Registrar
Detroit 21, Michigan

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as Richard's fantastic wooing of Anne in "Richard the Third."

Steiger's scene with the rest of his associates, however, have the raw brutality appropriate to racketeers who consider Chicago their private domain, which they divided up into their respective territories. Outstanding in the large supporting cast are Nehemiah Persoff as Torrio, Murvyn Vye as Bugs Moran, Lewis Charles as Hymie Weiss, Robert Gist as O'Banion, Joe DeSantis as Big Jim Colosimo—all playing formidable men with infamous names—and Martin Balsam as a reporter working for Capone and bumped off for switching his loyalty, and James Gregory as a good cop, practically the only one on the police force as far as we can make out, who tells part of the story. It is a grim story, told with tense and deadly seriousness that rises to a high pitch with the St. Valentine's Day massacre: It is a story of a fearful period in our history, the like of which we can hope will never come again.

STARTING WITH the 1929 climax of the Capone picture, "Some Like It Hot" covers the same period—but gives it the big razzberry. I'm not sure that the St. Valentine's Day massacre is a very good beginning for a comedy, but the film is determined to kid the whole crazy era—the flappers, the gangsters, the hootch drinkers and all the extra-curricular activities of the Jazz Age. When Tony Curtis and Jack Lemmon, as a couple of musicians, witness the massacre, they realize they have to get out of Chicago before Spats Colombo (George Raft) and his henchmen mow them down too. So Tony and Jack don women's clothes, join an all-girls' band and start with their new playmates for Florida. The high-jinks continue on the train, where the girls (including Marilyn Monroe as the band's singing Sugar) scramble through a cocktail party in Jack's berth, and at the lush Florida hotel where Tony doffs his feminine attire occasionally to pose as a millionaire and woo Sugar. Poor Jack, having to continue his disguise when gangsters arrive at the same hotel for a typical hoodlum convention, finds himself being wooed by a real millionaire (Joe E. Brown).

Some of this is really quite amusing, especially the slapstick showing the boys struggling with feminine garb; and some of the jokes, both visual and verbal, are pretty vulgar. Marilyn Monroe, after all her acting lessons and the improved performances in her last two pictures, is right back where she started, depending on her pretty face, baby-doll pout and low-cut dresses to win her audiences. Win them she does—with the help of Tony Curtis, who does clever impersonations of Cary Grant, and some period songs which Marilyn puts over with a calculated naiveté. But Billy Wilder, who gave the film its good production and direction, also wrote the script with I. A. L. Diamond and he continued the joke too long. After a while the *double entendres,* the boys in girls' clothes, the burlesquing of bootleggers and Monroe's petulant wisecracks grow tiresome. Still, as Joe E. Brown says, when Jack Lemmon finally admits he's a man, "Well, no one's perfect."

ALONG WITH "Some Like It Hot" in the free wheeling cycle of films that skirt around the edge of good taste ("The Tunnel of Love," "The Perfect Furlough," "Rally 'Round the Flag, Boys") is another new comedy called "The Mating Game." It has turned H. E. Bates' somewhat whimsical *The Darling Buds of May* into a broad and slapstick farce about a zany, Maryland family who have been evading the income tax for years and now see the earnest young tax collector as a likely prospect for their ripe-for-marriage, tomboyish daughter. Although the cast is good (Paul Douglas as Paw, Una Merkel as Maw, Debbie Reynolds as the hoyden daughter, Tony Randall as the bright but willing tax investigator) Director George Marshall allows them to overact and double-take throughout most of the jokes. What with its tumbles in the hay and wisecracks about the joys of irresponsibility, "The Mating Game" never decides whether it's kidding "You Can't Take It With You" or "God's Little Acre," and its humor becomes both forced and dull.

PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

COMMUNICATIONS

"WHAT PRICE HATE"

New York, N. Y.

TO THE EDITORS: In my article "What Price Hate?" [Mar. 6] I referred to Mr. John Hamilton of St. Louis, a one-time associate of Gerald L. K. Smith, later connected with the *White American News Service* and *The White Sentinel*. Parenthetically, I remarked that Mr. Hamilton "is at the moment in jail for a morals conviction." I now find that this statement was inaccurate. Mr. Hamilton was arrested on a morals charge, convicted and sentenced to two years in prison. However, on appeal the Supreme Court of Missouri reversed the conviction and ordered a new trial. In that second trial, Mr. Hamilton was acquitted. I regret the misstatement in my article, which was, of course, quite unintentional on my part.

JAMES RORTY.

Our thanks to Mr. Rorty for his correction. We too regret that the misstatement appeared in the pages of The Commonweal.

THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Meaning of a Singular Man

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF HENRY DAVID THOREAU. Edited by Walter Harding and Carl Bode. New York University Press. $12.50.

By JAMES B. STRONKS

HENRY THOREAU was not one to pour his heart's blood into mere letters. That he saved for his two-million-word journal, which, once Emerson had set him to it, increasingly absorbed his life. But if man-to-man communication was never much Henry's dish, the letters of so brilliant a phrase-maker and so important a thinker and doer can hardly fail to have their valuable moments; and it is a good thing that they have been assembled, corrected, and annotated in this fat, expensive book. Professors Harding and Bode, old Thoreau hands, have tracked down every known letter by Thoreau, including many never before published, and they also print every discoverable letter written *to* him. Hence the title.

Among them are commercial letters in which we discover that Thoreau, if he didn't watch himself, was rather adept at making money. We see him here as a sought-after surveyor, and as the "successful" manufacturer of lead pencils, a few of which left their indelible mark in the revision of the journals. Then there is his literary business: filling mail orders for his books, selling his articles, and arranging—rather grudgingly, to be sure—to deliver his lectures (which, he warns one lyceum manager, "will be *transcendental,* that is, to the mass of hearers, probably *moonshine.* Do you think that this will do? Or does your audience prefer lamplight, or total darkness these nights?").

As for the personal letters, they are impersonal. There is little more autobiographical "news" in them than there is in *Walden.* But there are acute portraits of such Concord worthies as Bronson Alcott and Ellery Channing, and, after a meeting in Brooklyn, a shrewd Yankee valuation of Walt Whitman as man and poet, the most imposing entity Thoreau had confronted. There is delightful counter-classmanship in his astringent reply to a Harvard questionnaire, a reply which all alumni secretaries should paste in their hats. There is his corrosive dressing down of James Russell Lowell, editor of the *Atlantic,* for deleting a blamelessly pagan sentence from "Chesuncook." There is a haunting seashore report from Fire Island after the shipwreck in which Margaret Fuller drowned, and a deadpan glimpse of a Quaker meeting at which, invited to let his inner voice speak out, Henry evidently treated the brothers to a quiet, comprehensive, Thoreauvian broadside that curled their hair.

The most solid, characteristic part of the correspondence, however, is philosophical—from and to Thoreau's disciples. Their lengthy, earnest attempts to ingratiate themselves are of interest mainly as the context for his answers. When he chose to reply at all to these intellectual mash notes, Thoreau was likely to start abruptly with a full-blast transcendental essay, heavily metaphorical, studded with the brilliant sentences at which he has had no superior in English, bristling with fresh tropes ("the excellent drainage of that city of God"), and tense with his usual metaphysical-like yoking of antitheses—all of which surprise the reader into awareness of an idea's further ramifications.

But beyond the facts, ideas, and rhetoric in Henry Thoreau's letters, one finishes this book impressed by the whole meaning of this singular man. Those who have comfortably written him off as ascetic and puritanical should look again to see if these traits were not more often strength and purity. In our fat and gadget-proliferating 1950's, it is sanative to get inside the head of a completely self-sufficient man who subsisted perfectly well upon two months of labor a year. In our time of faddish unconventionality,

Continuing Catholic Best Seller

THREE PRIESTS

by Joe Dever

"This solid, realistic novel brings to life a whole era and a whole facet of American life. It is bustlingly alive, busting out all over, and the three priests are, praise be, good ones everyone, and different as only those 'within the unity' dare to be."—ANNE FREMANTLE, The Commonweal

HAVE YOU READ IT YET?

$4.50 at all booksellers

DOUBLEDAY

RELIGIOUS ART PILGRIMAGE

led by

FATHER RALPH S. MARCH

REVEREND RALPH MARCH—Formerly of *Marquette University, now at University of* Dallas, Texas. Host Director *"Religious Art of Europe"*. Collections, Galleries, Cathedrals, Shrines. Religious, Social Cultural, Holiday Program, 12 Countries, First Class Hotels, Deluxe Motorcoach, on the Golden Circle Tour, $1079.00. Guests list limited; invite prompt registration.

Departure July 18 from New York
Price: $1079.00

Request Brochure

CULTURAL TRAVEL CENTER

7 East 48 Street • New York 17, N.Y.
A Division of American Tourist Bureau, Inc.

Coming April 3

EDUCATION ISSUE

of The Commonweal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or of bland, middle-of-the-road "opinions"—a favorite substitute for thinking—it is bracing to knock heads with an honest-to-god original, a consistent and thoroughgoing radical idealist.

And those who complain of being trapped in—that is to say, seduced into—a rat race, could do worse than pay attention to this walker and woodsman who had the nerve always to do what he wanted. A man who, at forty-four, from his last sickbed, could serenely dictate the conclusion to his correspondence: "I *suppose* that I have not many months to live; but, of course, I know nothing about it. I may add that I am enjoying existence as much as ever, and regret nothing."

Intractable Plot

EIGHT DAYS. By Gabriel Fielding. Morrow. $4.50.

By JEAN HOLZHAUER

GABRIEL FIELDING, whose first novel, *In the Time of Greenbloom,* attracted considerable notice, borrows a pattern popularized by Graham Greene for his second. *Eight Days* combines a torrid and exotic setting, a suspenseful plot including international intrigue, and central characters who, as Catholics, divide their attention between saving their souls and saving their mortal hides.

William Chance is, if his name can be trusted, a kind of symbolic hero. He has spent years as doctor to the inmates of a Scottish prison. Now recently a widower and even more recently a convert to the Church, he is seeking respite in the challenge and obscure danger of a North African International Zone.

Thus all but stripped of his identity and ready for anything, he proceeds to find it. On the first day of his sabbatical he meets a former prisoner, a homicidal Jewish psychopath for whom Chance has a certain sympathy. He also meets a colony of alarming expatriates, among them the McGrady's. McGrady believes that he is dying of cancer, and Chance is able to arrange a biopsy and diagnosis.

Chance falls in love with Mrs. McGrady, but since both are Catholic they avoid sin and discuss the problem of grace instead. (In one tense scene, Chance avoids sin by taking a double dose of sleeping pills: the old cake-of-ice treatment brought up to date!)

While all this is going on, the psychopath manages another murder, a mistaken identity problem intrudes, and an Uprising blows half the Zone sky-high, threatening all their lives. Chance, who has an ulcer, understandably hemmorhages. But nearly everybody survives, more or less physically and morally intact.

Mr. Fielding writes well, endowing both the cops-and-robbers episodes and the dialogues about grace and other matters with color and urgency. Yet his plot defies summary and his conclusions—if such they be—are similarly intractable. In the end I was reminded of a friend who once, skipping down a Maine beach in company with a sandpiper, paused to cock his shining eye at the bird. "Tell me," he said, "what is it you are trying to *say* to me?"

Early Romance

THE LOST FIGHT. By H. F. M. Prescott. Dodd, Mead. $3.95.

By ELIZABETH BARTELME

SEVERAL YEARS ago H.F.M. Prescott scored a critical and, to a lesser degree, popular success with *The Man on a Donkey,* an intricately constructed, intensely compelling historical novel built around the brief Reformation uprising known as "The Pilgrimage of Grace." Spurred by the reviews, her publishers began moving backward in time, reissuing first her superb scholarly work on Mary Tudor —a model of creative biography— and then two of her earlier novels, good of their kind, but neither of them of the stature of the Reformation novel.

Now the third of these lesser works, *The Lost Fight,* has been brought out in this country, and, since it was first published thirty years ago, one may assume that it marks Miss Prescott's beginnings, or very nearly so. Miss Prescott's beginnings were good ones but they cannot avoid suffering by comparison with her fulfillment, for while in this most recently issued novel the author's talent is everywhere evident, her immaturity as a writer is equally pervasive.

She has chosen as her story a romantic tale of the love and spiritual struggle of a medieval man whose deepest confidence is in his own strength. Trained to honesty, courage and responsibility, Adam of Morteigne errs on the side of self-righteousness. Justice, to him, is a far greater virtue than mercy, and when he is excommunicated for carrying out justice in the brutal thirteenth-century fashion, he feels, and perhaps rightly, that he has been wronged. When he finds that the bishop with whom he has had his dispute has not only declared him anathema, but has found a technicality to set aside Adam's marriage, the young man's anger is slow and deep.

Putting his problem in the hands of a clerical relative in Rome, he joins a group of Crusaders and goes off to Cyprus to await the outcome of his case. There Adam soon finds himself involved in a mild flirtation with the pretty sister-in-law of Sir Guillaume, his host, and begins to consider the possibility of marrying her. Then he discovers it is not Erembors he loves but her sister Douce, the wife of Sir Guillaume.

The situation is familiar enough: the unhappily married woman who responds to an attractive, available man, who in his turn feels that he has at last found the woman who understands him. It is then that the "fight" begins. Douce is a chaste woman, but a proud one; Adam is an honorable man, but a man who does not know the meaning of humility. Each is convinced of his own virtues and ability to withstand temptation. The forbidden fruit grows sweeter and sweeter until at last Douce plucks it and offers it to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Educational

MAINE

St. Francis College

Conducted by the Franciscan Fathers. Small 4-year liberal arts college for men. B.A. degree. Majors in 5 fields. Organized sports: basketball, soccer, baseball, tennis; swimming, boating on Maine Coast. Two hours from Boston. Tuition, board and room: $1215. Catalog. Director of Admissions, 592 Pool St., Biddeford, Maine.

INDIANA

Saint Mary's College Notre Dame

Graduate School of Sacred Theology For Sisters and Laywomen. Distinguished faculty of Religious and Lay Professors. Saint Mary's College, Box 11, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Classified

• RATES: $1 a line, or 6 words, 2-line minimum. Discounts: 3 times, 5%; 7 times, 10%; 13 times, 15%. Payable in advance. DISPLAY: $10.78 per inch, same discounts.

Irish Books and Gifts

• Books, Linens, Gifts, Catalogs. IRISH INDUSTRIES DEPOT, INC. 870 Lexington Ave., (near 65th) New York

Chesterton and Belloc

• All Chesterton's and Belloc's Books 250 Titles, Free Catalogue. Prosser, 3118 N. Keating, Chicago 41, Ill.

Sleep Learning

• EXPERIMENT WITH "SLEEP-LEARNING"! Use your phonograph, recorder. Fascinating, educational. Catalog, details free. Sleep-Learning Research Association, Box 24-CW, Olympia, Washington.

Handmade Wedding Bands

• HANDMADE LITURGICAL WEDDING BANDS. Renard A. Koehnemann, P.O. Box 575. Chesterton, Indiana.

Watercolor Prints

• ROME—Watercolor prints by Raimondi: St. Peter's; Fountain of Trevi; Colosseum. Three for $5. ELIAS, 116 Winslow Place, Garwood, N. J.

Teaching Position Wanted

• FRENCH. Ph.D. Assoc. Prof. Courses various levels. Oral skill emphasis. Available Sept. Write BOX 313, THE COMMONWEAL.

Adam who renounces honor and friendship for desire. The consequences are tragic, immediately for the woman, more enduring for the man. But Adam's "lost fight" brings him to a self-knowledge that moderates his harsh judgment with charity and gives him the sure knowledge that "God is sufficient to fill everything."

With such a theme, one would like to be able to say that Miss Prescott has made Adam's struggle absorbing and significant, but she has made it only just a little more than dull. For one thing, Adam, though believable and consistent in character, is not very interesting. Douce is a romanticized woman without vitality and depth, except for brief flashes when her creator, relaxing from a descriptive technique, lets her emerge as a personality. The minor characters are carefully developed within their scope, but none of them, including Adam and Douce, manages to be truly memorable.

Miss Prescott, as she has proved since, can skillfully recreate an unfamiliar world, but here the framework of the building shows too clearly, and description overwhelms narrative to the detriment of a harmonious whole.

Perhaps one would be inclined to be less critical of this novel had not Miss Prescott demonstrated so clearly in her later work the remarkable range of her talent. But while her reputation will not be enhanced by this new edition of an old work, neither will it be impaired if one considers what she has since produced. A writer with *The Man on a Donkey, Mary Tudor, Friar Felix at Large* and *Once to Sinai* behind her has nothing to worry about.

REVIEWERS

James B. Stronks teaches American literature at the Chicago division of the University of Illinois.

Jean Holzhauer, a regular contributor, has written for *The Critic, Today* and other publications.

Elizabeth Bartelme, a frequent reviewer for The Commonweal, is on the editorial staff of a New York publishing house.

Statesman-priest, soldier, scholar, Vatican emissary to the capitals of the world, but

ABOVE ALL A SHEPHERD

POPE JOHN XXIII

By Ugo Groppi and Julius Lombardi. An intimate and revealing portrait of the man who guides nearly 500,000,000 souls, a dramatic account of the events that led to his election, and a valuable summary of the tasks and challenges now facing him. With 24 historic photographs.

$3.95, now at your bookstore

P. J. KENEDY & SONS

Printers to the Holy Apostolic See since 1895

THEOLOGY for LAYMEN

Lectures and discussions at the HOUSE OF STUDIES—OUR LADY OF WISDOM

Open June 1—September 28

Lectures in English

July 4—September 7

near beautiful Lake Memphremagog which straddles the Vermont-Canada border. Well-appointed house, large library, good food, lake and mountain sports, proximity to the Benedictine Abbey of Saint Benoit du Lac. With the approval of His Excellency the Most Reverend Georges Cabana, Archbishop of Sherbrooke. Reasonable rates. Write early for reservations to:

MISS NATALIE LINCOLN, Ph.L.
4306 Russell Ave.
Mt. Rainier, Maryland

MARYWOOD COLLEGE

Accredited Catholic college for women. B.A., B.S., B.M. degrees. Art, business, psychology, drama, guidance counseling, liberal arts, librarianship, liturgical music, medical technology, music (N.A.S.M.), science, special education, teaching (elem. & sec.), vocational home ec. Master's degrees in education, psychology, librarianship. Conducted by Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Catalog. Give date of H. S. graduation.

REGISTRAR, MARYWOOD COLLEGE, BOX C, SCRANTON, PA.

LA SALLE Military Academy

Foremost Catholic military preparatory school under Christian Brothers. Accredited college preparation. Grades 9-12. Small classes. ROTC highest rating. Beautiful 160-acre campus on Great South Bay. 76th year. Write for Catalog.

Box W, Oakdale, L.I., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Variety and Substance

New readers of The Commonweal are frequently as much pleased by the variety they encounter in the magazine as they are by the quality of the writing. The last trial subscription period of thirteen weeks, for example, brought them the following articles, among others:

The Man's Man	John P. Sisk
Socialism in Europe Today	Michael P. Fogarty
Pilgrimage to Mexico	Dorothy Day
Christ and India	Bede Griffiths
Whatever Happened to Radio?	Donald P. Costello
The Expansion of Christianity	Chrisopher Dawson
Vindication for the Nisei	Ted Le Berthon
The German Question	Donald Brandon
The Meaning of Racism	George H. Dunne
Prisoners of the Nile	Edward Wakin
China's Great Leap	Michael Harrington
Bigotry in California	Lawrence T. King
Castro's "Operacion Verdad"	James Finn
The Voices of Robert Frost	Rosemary F. Deen
Literature and Morality	Richard Horchler
American Retrospect	George N. Shuster
Christians in the Arab World	Alan Neame
A U. N. Police Force?	Robert C. Good

A similar range of varied and significant concerns will be manifest in The Commonweal during the next thirteen weeks. They will be warmly welcomed by readers interested in the world's newsworthy happenings, in outstanding books of the season and meaningful ideas generally. The coupon below, with two dollars, will bring you a baker's dozen of the interesting issues planned for the weeks just ahead.

SPECIAL TRIAL OFFER

NOT FOR CURRENT RENEWALS

THE COMMONWEAL, 386 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

Enclosed is $2.00. Please send the next 13 issues of The Commonweal to:

Name .....

Address .....

City .....

3/20/59

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED